(1)

From the desk of



W. ROY WATSON

Mr. Garrison:

In analyzing the photos which were taken comparing here, at the investigation of Fred Newcomb, I find much to be concerned about.

As you see, we've discovered that the head on both of these photos must be from one negative. I simply don't feel that there is any potential of having such total registration.

(2)

From the desk of



W. ROY WATSON

between two photos of a person from different negatives.

Further; the lighting on the head and the lighting on the body seemed to be dissimilar.

Measurements also indicate disparity.

Head size being equal in accompanying photo "A" and photo "B" and selecting photo "A" as the photo most nearly in balance as to head to body size ratio

(3)

From the desk of

W. ROY WATSON

and assuming a height of 5'9" from the top of the head to the ball of the weight bearing foot we have a reference dimension from point "Z" at the top of the head to point "X" at the ball of the weight bearing foot.

On photo "B" the decreased distance from point "Z" to point "X" (although the head size is the same) would indicate a height

(4)

From the desk of

W. ROY WATSON

of only 5' 6½"

This is based on the fact that the body balance, which, of course, must include the head, must be placed or centered over the weight bearing foot in a static pose.

It would seem that this principle was neglected in the thinking applied to sizing the head for the composites It seems obvious to me

(5)

From the desk of

W. ROY WATSON

that on photo "B", the
non weight bearing
foot was chosen for
dimensioning purposes.
This foot, being nearer
to the camera than
the weight bearing foot,
throws off all the normal
calculations and results
in the appearance of
either a larger head
or a smaller body
See reference point "4".

W. Roy Watson

P.S. We could furnish some additional
overlays if needed.

W. ROY WATSON - Advertising Photographers